

by a long shot, in my view, that any negative impact in any sector in any way would come from this amendment. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, we are moments away from offering a unanimous consent request. I don't know who is going to get the floor next, but whoever gets the floor, I ask if Senators will allow an interruption for the unanimous consent request. It should be coming in a matter of a couple of minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, thank you very much. I will proceed until such time as the unanimous consent request is put into effect.

I listened carefully to the comments of the Senator from Delaware, and obviously the Senator from Utah. I think the comments of the Senator from Utah do not really change the equation at all because the real question here is, Why is America being asked to pay this \$87 billion? What is the context within which the average citizen of America, the average taxpayer is now being told, Whoops, we have a whole different situation here. We have to pay \$87 billion in addition to the \$79 billion Americans have already invested in the war to date.

Most Americans think this is sort of the bill for the war. It is not. We are well over \$160 billion or \$170 billion already once you add the \$87 billion, and most people believe it is going to go beyond that.

The question is, What is the fair distribution of this burden in the overall context of our economy to the average taxpayer of America? Is it right for President Bush and for the Republicans to be asking America to give an enormous tax cut to the wealthiest of Americans and spend the \$87 billion, which also adds to the deficit for this year?

No one will come to the Senate and say the \$500 billion deficit we are facing next year is going to be wiped out by growth in the economy when we are not even adding jobs in the growth to the economy today.

I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote in relation to the pending Biden amendment occur at 3:15 p.m. today with no amendment in order to the amendment prior to the vote, provided the debate before the vote be 30 minutes under the control of the Republican side and the remaining time under the Democratic leader or his designee.

Mr. REID. I ask that the Senator allow the consent to be modified, as follows: Senator BIDEN be recognized for 30 minutes, within the time allocated to us; Senator KENNEDY for 15 minutes; Senator KERRY for 20 minutes; Senator KOHL for 5 minutes; Senator CLINTON for 10 minutes; Senator CONRAD for 15 minutes; Senator Jack Reed for 5 minutes; Senator DURBIN for 5 minutes; Senator FEINSTEIN for 10

minutes; Senator JOHNSON for 5 minutes; Senator CARPER for 5 minutes; and if there is any time remaining, it would be under the control of the Senator from Delaware.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Reserving the right to object, I ask that this be amended, since I have been waiting, so that I follow Senator KERRY for my time.

Mr. REID. I think that is appropriate. And Senator BUNNING will follow Senator FEINSTEIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. The question we ought to be asking is, What is the right thing to do that is in keeping with the values of America? We have the worst economy we have had, the worst jobs economy since Herbert Hoover was President of the United States; 3.1 million Americans have lost their jobs, 2.7 million manufacturing jobs have been lost. All across America, people are watching outsourcing taking place as jobs are going to China, India, and other countries. They are not being replaced. We just picked up the newspapers a couple of days ago and saw that 2 million Americans have lost their health insurance retirement, it has been blown away for countless numbers of Americans. Health care has been lost for 2 million Americans. Governors across the country are raising taxes and cutting services. Infrastructure investments are being deferred.

What the Republicans and the President are asking is that we take another \$87 billion and still keep a tax cut for the wealthiest people in our country who are doing the best, who are already the most comfortable, who are perfectly prepared to do their part to sacrifice, to contribute, not to grow the deficit—indeed, to relieve some of the financial pressure of this country, literally, to make things more fair in America.

What this is about is called fundamental fairness. Fairness. It is not about class warfare. This is not about redistribution. Is it fair in America to suggest that you can add to the deficit—which it will this year—to suggest all of the figures of this administration, which have been wrong, can be wiped away on the backs of the average American so that the wealthiest people in the country can keep their tax cut? That is the question. It is a pretty simple fundamental question.

If others want to come to the Senate and defend the notion, it is absolutely OK to be misled, to have major players in the administration tell us, it is only going to cost \$50 billion; it will come out of the Iraqi oil; don't worry about it. And every one of those promises have been wiped away and left in tatters across this country.

Americans are angry about this. What is the Senate going to do? Stand here and defend the proposition that America in its current fiscal condition can support a tax cut for the wealth-

est Americans at the expense of common sense and fairness? That is what this vote is about. That is what this choice is about.

It also is about the fundamental realities of how we got here. Last spring, our fighting men and women swept across the battlefields of Iraq. There is not anyone in the Senate who is not proud of what they accomplished in military terms. Thanks to their courage and their skills, Saddam Hussein and his henchmen are scattered and that brutal regime is no more.

But in the aftermath of that military victory, just as many Members predicted, in the absence of building a coalition, in the absence of doing the diplomacy, in the absence of showing patience and maturity, in the absence of living up to our highest values and standards about how we take a nation to war, we are now in danger of losing the peace.

The clearest symbol of that danger is the target on the backs of young American men and women in Iraq. Today, soldiers in Baghdad fear getting shot simply going out and getting a drink of water. A squad at a checkpoint has to worry whether a station wagon coming at them is a mobile bomb. And troops moving in convoy take RPGs and improvised explosive devices, and we pick up the papers each day and hear the news about three, two, one more young American life lost because we failed to plan to win the peace adequately, we failed to put in place the greatest protection possible for these troops, which is what they are owed.

Now we know Iraq's infrastructure needs to be rebuilt and we face the challenge of forging a new government and giving it legitimacy under circumstances that were entirely predictable and entirely ignored by this administration. We were told by this administration, in their confidence—and, may I add, in their arrogance—that the Iraqis would see us as liberators.

They see us as occupiers—again, something many predicted absent the effort to try to globalize our effort. They see us as a foreign power ruling over their country, preventing self-determination, not providing it. We were told to expect elections and quick transition to self-governance. But now we know those elections may be many months away at best.

None of this was planned or predicted by the President or his war counsel. Eager to rush to war, the administration played down or, worse, ignored the likelihood of resistance. It lowballed the number of forces that would be needed to seize the alleged WMD sites, for which the war was fought, to protect the infrastructure, and underestimated the magnitude of the reconstruction task and the ease with which oil would flow for rebuilding. It refused to tell the American people upfront the long-term costs of winning the peace.

I remember the distinguished former President pro tempore and leader of the Democrats, the Senator from West